



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,789	01/30/2001	Andrzej S. Mamona	0100.0001360	1544
29153	7590	12/20/2005	EXAMINER	
ATI TECHNOLOGIES, INC. C/O VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHLZ, P.C. 222 N.LASALLE STREET CHICAGO, IL 60601			VO, CLIFF N	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2676
DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/772,789	MAMONA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CLIFF N. VO	2676	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5,7-8,10, 12-14 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 4,6,9,11 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to the Amendment filed on 1/26/2004 which has been entered into the record of file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 7-8 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, III et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,724,492).

As per independent claims 1, 7 and 13, Matthews, III et al disclose a method and system for rotating an image using texture mapping (col.15, lines 47-51) comprising a step of receiving a command to rotate a source image located in off-screen memory, defining the source image as a texture and mapping the source image as a texture into rotated destination area (col.16, line 58 through col.17, line 44). It should be noticed that Matthews, III et al fail to explicitly disclose a step of calculating the vertices of the rotated destination area; however, Matthews, III et al disclose the area, e.g. panel, may be defined as a polygon on a polyhedron at Fig.6. Furthermore, it is well known in the art that such shapes are usually defined by vertices. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to calculate the vertices in Matthews, III et al system because vertices are an efficient means for representing polygons.

As per dependent claims 3, 8 and 14, Matthews, III et al further teach the features as now claimed at Fig.6, i.e. 90 degrees.

4. Claims 2, 5, 10, 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, III et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,724,492) in view of Deering (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,206).

As per dependent claims 2, 5, 10, 12 and 16, it should be noticed that Matthews, III et al fail to teach a step of tessellating the source image into a plurality of primitive vertices, wherein the primitive vertices are one of triangle and rectangular vertices such that 3D rendering with texture mapping is used. However, Deering discloses another graphics system for generating and displaying 3D images including tessellating the source images into a plurality of triangle and rectangular vertices at col.32, lines 5-21.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a step of tessellating the source images as taught by Deering into Matthews, III et al in order to make it more efficient since it would have generated a smoother and more accurate result image as suggested by Deering at col.32, lines 15-17.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 4, 6, 9, 11 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 1/26/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues in his Remark section that the cited prior art fails to teach the claimed features by stating "Matthews, III et al fails to teach the process of receiving a command to rotate a source image located in off-screen memory". The examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument since Matthews, III et al clearly teach this feature at col.16, lines 57-60, i.e. "the channel manager object (source image) is not displayed on the monitor" ("located in off-screen memory") which can be rotated by a rotating command described at col.17, lines 2-4. Furthermore, applicant argues that Matthews, III et al fail to teach "mapping the source image as a texture into the rotated destination area". However, applicant admitted Matthews, III et al teach "texture mapping in which a two-dimensional surface is applied to a 3D object such as the face of a 3D object". The examiner can not find the differences between Matthews, III et al's texture mapping as asserted by the applicant and the feature as now claimed "mapping the source image as a texture" of the instant application. Therefore, the examiner maintains the rejections as set in above. Moreover, the applicant further argues there is no motivation to applied Deering's tessellating method into Matthews, III et al system. The examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument because Matthews, III et al teach a method of rotating a source image located in the off screen area. However, Matthews, III et al fail to specifically teach which method of rendering the final object at the destination area. Deering teaches a step of tessellating the source image into micro-polygons in order to achieve a smoother and more accurate result image. Thus,

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a step of tessellating the source images as taught by Deering into Matthews, III et al in order to make it more efficient since it would have generated a smoother and more accurate result image as suggested by Deering at col.32, lines 15-17. Finally, applicant argues that Matthews, III et al fail to teach *user selection* of the orientation of a rotated image. Applicant is respectfully requested to refer to col.15, lines 20-25, i.e. "when the menu key is pressed" by the user [sic], the source image will be rotated 90 degrees as now claimed.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CLIFF N. VO whose telephone number is 571-272-7651. The examiner can normally be reached on 2nd Monday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MATTHEW BELLA can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CLIFF N VO
Examiner
Art Unit 2676

CV

Matthew C. Bella

MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600